



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/191,520	11/13/1998	JOHN S. HENDRICKS	SEDN/5217	8726

56015 7590 05/03/2007.  
PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, LLP/  
SEDNA PATENT SERVICES, LLC  
595 SHREWSBURY AVENUE  
SUITE 100  
SHREWSBURY, NJ 07702

EXAMINER
----------

KOENIG, ANDREW Y

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2623

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

05/03/2007

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>		<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/191,520		HENDRICKS ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>		<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Andrew Y. Koenig		2623	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 January 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) See Continuation Sheet is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) See Continuation Sheet is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

**Continuation of Disposition of Claims:** Claims pending in the application are 1-11,16,17,37,40,60,67-70,85,86,97,99,102,104,111,113,115,116,127-129,137-139 and 169-174.

**Continuation of Disposition of Claims:** Claims rejected are 1-11,16,17,37,40,60,67-70,85,86,97,99,102,104,111,113,115,116,127-129,137-139 and 169-174.

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Arguments***

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-11, 16, 17, 37, 40, 60, 67-70, 85, 86, 97, 99, 102, 104, 111, 113, 115, 116, 127-129, 137-139, and 169-174 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.
2. The applicant argues Boyer '085, Bestler, and Boyer '660 fail to teach a first receiver module located at a first site of a first subscriber that receives program data and a second receiver module located at a second site of a second subscriber geographically remote from the first site. The examiner disagrees; Boyer '660 teaches a first receiver module located at a first site of a first subscriber (at work) that receives program data and a second receiver module (at home) located at a second site of a second subscriber geographically remote from the first site (pg 3, para. 0044, pg. 5, para. 0062-0063), wherein the first and second user is the same user. Whereas the applicant supports providing a program or subscription to another subscriber, such as a gift using the specification, the claims do not preclude this interpretation.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2623

4. Claims 1-3, 9, 16, 37, 40, 99, 102, 104, 111, 113, 127-129, and 137-139 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication 2003/0066085 to Boyer et al. (Boyer '085) in view of U.S. Patent 5,517,502 to Bestler et al. (Bestler) and U.S. Patent Application Publication 2005/0138660 to Boyer et al. (Boyer '660).

Regarding claim 1, Boyer '085 teaches a personal computer accessing a web page via the Internet for receiving program data (pg. 3, para. 0053, pg. 3, para. 0056, pg. 4, para. 0065, pg. 4, para. 0069), which reads on the claimed first receiver module that receives program data.

Boyer '085 teaches ordering pay-per-view events via the web pages of the Internet, and having information sent to a headend (pg. 9, para. 0131-0133) and a separate television for receiving video signals (pg. 3, para. 0056, pg. 4, para. 0069), but is silent on a module for receiving a local authorization code, wherein the code allows the digital broadcast television programs to be decrypted for viewing. Bestler teaches conditional access (CA) packets multiplexed into the transport stream (claimed local authorization code) (col. 3, ll. 18-23) for decrypting the program, which reads on a second receiver module for receiving local authorization code, wherein the code allows the digital broadcast television programs to be decrypted for viewing. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Boyer '085 by a module for receiving a local authorization code, wherein the code allows the digital broadcast television programs to be decrypted for

viewing as taught by Bestler in order to enable the system to decrypt the requested programs, thereby enabling the headend to authorize the display of the pay-per-view event. Boyer '085 teaches a transmitting that sends a program selection to a remote site, wherein the program selection is made from the program data received by the first receiver module and contains address information (via entry of the telephone number and personal identification number) of the second receiver module (pg. 9, para. 0131-0133); and

Boyer '085 teaches the program selection is received at the remote site (pg. 9, para. 0131-0133) and Boyer '085 recognizes that the web server can direct conventional equipment at the headend to authorize the display of the ordered even (pg. 9, para. 0133), but is silent on a memory coupled to the second receiver module for storing the received authorization code, and the remote site sends the local authorization code, wherein the code is stored in memory until needed for decrypting the selected program at a future time. Bestler teaches memory for storing the authorization code (col. 8, ll. 40-43) until needed for decrypting the program (col. 10, ll. 1-13). Bestler teaches the decoder transmitting a program selection from the decoder to the controller (claimed remote site) (fig. 7, lab 302) where the controller generates and sends the local authorization code (col. 7, ll. 37-40, col. 11, ll. 51-61). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Boyer '085 by a memory coupled to the second receiver module for storing the received authorization code, and the remote site sends the local authorization code, wherein the code is stored in memory until needed for decrypting

Art Unit: 2623

the selected program at a future time as taught by Bestler in order to store codes for use with decryption, thereby to enable the system to selectively authorize devices for viewing programming thus providing a revenue source for the headend.

Boyer '085 and Bestler are silent on a first receiver located at a first site, and a second receiver located at a second site geographically remote from the first site. In analogous art, Boyer '660 teaches a personal computer (28) for viewing an Web-based EPG (pg. 2, para. 0036), and a second receiver at the home, which is geographically remote from the first site (pg. 3, para. 0044), wherein the user is able to access the web page and order pay-per-view events through the web interface and deliver the event to their multimedia system (fig. 9, pg. 3, para. 0062-0063), which reads on a first receiver located at a first site, and a second receiver located at a second site geographically remote from the first site.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Internet based EPG of Boyer '085 and Bestler by a first receiver located at a first site, and a second receiver located at a second site geographically remote from the first site as taught by Boyer '660 in order to facilitate users by enabling the user to order programs using a web-interface, thereby permitting users to order programs from a geographically remote location and thus increasing the usability of the system.

Art Unit: 2623

Regarding claim 2, the combination of Boyer '085 and Bestler has already been discussed; Bestler teaches a conditional access module (claimed second receiver) (fig. 1) and a processor for processing the code to decrypt the program (fig. 1, label 40)

Regarding claim 3, the combination of Boyer '085 and Bestler teaches incorporating the components (processor, second receiver, and memory) within a set top terminal (Boyer '085: pg. 4, para. 0071), which is capable of being operably connected to a television.

Regarding claim 9, Boyer '085 teaches the first receiver as a personal computer (fig. 1, label 40, fig. 3, label 106).

Regarding claim 16, the combination of Boyer '085 and Bestler has already been discussed; Bestler teaches multiplexing the local authorization code with the program (col. 3, ll. 18-22).

Regarding claim 37, Boyer '085 teaches the second site comprises a web page of the Internet, wherein the page includes the program data and generates a request (pg. 4, para. 0067, pg. 9, para. 0131-0133).

Regarding claim 40, the combination of Boyer '085 and Bestler has already been discussed; Bestler teaches an authorization code addressed to specific terminals (col.



8, ll. 8-13) with an identification code identifies which programs the user is authorized to view (col. 9, ll. 28-42).

Regarding claim 99, the limitations of claim 99 have been addressed in the discussion of claim 1. Claim 99 adds the limitation of displaying the program data as a program menu, which is taught by Boyer '085 in at least figure 28.

Regarding claim 102, Boyer '085 teaches data provided on an Internet web site.

Regarding claim 104, Boyer '085 teaches that the program order is received at a remote location (pg. 9, para. 0132-0133)

Regarding claim 111, Boyer '085 teaches that the program order is received at a remote location and sent to a digital programming broadcaster (pg. 9, para. 0132-0133).

Regarding claim 113, the combination of Boyer '085 and Bestler has already been discussed; Bestler teaches multiplexing the local authorization code with the program (col. 3, ll. 18-22).

Regarding claim 127, the limitations of claim 127 have been addressed in the discussion of claim 1.

Regarding claim 128, the combination of Boyer '085 and Bestler has already been discussed; Bestler teaches multiplexing the local authorization code with the program and demultiplexing (col. 3, ll. 18-22).

Regarding claim 129, Boyer teaches a remote site transmitting the authorization signal to a broadcast (pg. 9, para. 0132-0133), wherein the broadcaster broadcasts the multiplexed digital programs as discussed with Bestler.

Regarding claim 137, Boyer '085 teaches generating a program guide and transmitting the guide, wherein selections are made based upon the guide (see fig. 27-28, 31).

Regarding claim 138, Boyer '085 teaches the guide is broadcast to the first terminal.

Regarding claim 139, Boyer '085 teaches the guide is broadcast to the first terminal.

5. Claims 4 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication 2003/0066085 to Boyer et al. (Boyer '085), U.S. Patent 5,517,502 to Bestler et al. (Bestler), and U.S. Patent Application Publication

Art Unit: 2623

2005/0138660 to Boyer et al. (Boyer '660) in view of U.S. Patent 5,600,364 to Hendricks et al. (Hendricks '364).

Regarding claim 4, Boyer '085 teaches a television (see fig. 1, label 54, fig. 3, label 120), Bestler teaches a connection to a video display (col. 3, ll. 31-38), which displays the analog image. However, Boyer '085 and Bestler are silent on displaying on an analog television. Hendricks '364 teaches converting a compressed image to analog to be displayed on the television (col. 7, ll. 48-49). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Boyer '085 by displaying the decompressed images on the television as taught by Hendricks '364 in order to effectively display the images and information to the user.

Regarding claim 17, Boyer '085 and Bestler are silent on teaching a remote control and the details of a menu and scrolling the program guide for a desired programming. Hendricks '364 teaches a remote control and navigating through a program guide for desired programming (col. 12-13, ll. 65-5; col. 13, ll. 23-38). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Boyer '085 by using a remote control and navigating through a program guide as taught by Hendricks '364 in order to provide a more user friendly environment for choosing desired programs.

6. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication 2003/0066085 to Boyer et al. (Boyer '085), U.S. Patent 5,517,502 to Bestler et al. (Bestler), and U.S. Patent Application Publication 2005/0138660 to Boyer et al. (Boyer '660) in view of U.S. Patent 5,880,769 to Nemirofsky et al.

Regarding claim 5, Bestler teaches a conditional access unit but Boyer '085 and Bestler are silent on a smart card. Nemirofsky teaches using a smart card and transmitter in a smart card (col. 2, ll. 45-50). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Boyer '085 by implementing a smart card with a transmitter as taught by Nemirofsky in order to maintain security and automate transactions.

Boyer '085 is silent on a digital television. Official Notice is taken that digital televisions are well known in the art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Boyer '085 by using a digital television in order to provide an integrated digital system thereby reducing the number of components.

7. Claims 6-8, 10, and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication 2003/0066085 to Boyer et al. (Boyer '085), U.S. Patent 5,517,502 Bestler et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication 2005/0138660 to Boyer et al. (Boyer '660), and U.S. Patent 5,880,769 to Nemirofsky et al. in view of U.S. Patent 5,809,204 to Young et al.

Regarding claim 6, Boyer '085 and Bestler are silent on second receiver incorporated into the digital television. As discussed in claim 5, the examiner asserts that digital televisions are well known in the art. Furthermore, Young teaches that integrating components is well known (col. 12, ll. 48-54). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Boyer '085 by integrating the first receiver of Bestler into a digital television in order to provide an integrated digital system thereby reducing the number of components.

Regarding claim 7 and 8, claim 7 introduces a third receiver but the examiner notes that it is substantially similar to that of Bestler except that the location is in the digital television. Accordingly, the limitations of claims 7 and 8 have been addressed in the discussion of claims 5 and 6.

Regarding claim 10, the limitations of claim 10 have been addressed in the discussion of claim 6.

Regarding claim 11, the limitations of claim 11 have been addressed in the discussion of claims 6 and 9.

8. Claims 67-70, 85, 97, and 169-174 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication 2003/0066085 to Boyer et al. (Boyer '085) in view of U.S. Patent 5,600,364 to Hendricks et al. (Hendricks '364), U.S. Patent 5,517,502 to Bestler et al. (Bestler), and U.S. Patent Application Publication 2005/0138660 to Boyer et al. (Boyer '660).

Regarding claim 67, Boyer '085 teaches order and account verification information being processed, which inherently has a system to perform the functions, wherein the system receives the requests from a personal computer accessing a web-page (pg. 4, para. 0069, pg. 9, para. 0132), which equates to an order and authorization system that receives a program order from a first terminal in a television distribution network and generates an authorization order that authorizes access to a program.

Boyer '085 teaches a headend authorizing display of the ordered event (pg. 9, para. 0133), but is silent on a billing system coupled to the order and authorization system, wherein the billing system receives the order and generates a billing record. Hendricks '364 teaches a billing system coupled to an order and authorization system, and the billing system receives the orders and generates a billing record (col. 40, ll. 21-29). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Boyer '085 by a billing system coupled to the order and authorization system, wherein the billing system receives the order and generates a billing record as taught by Hendricks '364 in order appropriately charge customers for their respective services.

Boyer '085 teaches a headend coupled to the order and authorization system, and seconding the program to a second terminal (set top box) in the television distribution network (pg. 9, para. 0132-0133), but is silent on how the data is sent to the second terminal, specifically, Boyer '085 is silent on the program is multiplexed with other programs, the authorization providing a local authorization code addressed to the second terminal, wherein the authorization code allows the terminal to demultiplex,

decrypt and display the program. Bestler teaches a cable decoder (fig. 1) for receiving a digital broadcast television program (col. 2, ll. 55-67). Furthermore, Bestler teaches receiving programs (claimed program data) (col. 3, ll. 1-17, col. 4, ll. 17-20), and conditional access (CA) packets multiplexed into the transport stream (claimed local authorization code) (col. 3, ll. 18-23) for decrypting the program. Additionally, Bestler teaches memory for storing the authorization code (col. 8, ll. 40-43) until needed for decrypting and displaying the program (col. 10, ll. 1-13). Bestler teaches the decoder transmitting a program selection from the decoder to the controller (claimed remote site) (fig. 7, lab 302) where the controller generates and sends the local authorization code (col. 7, ll. 37-40, col. 11, ll. 51-61). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Boyer '085 by multiplexed the program with other programs, the authorization providing a local authorization code addressed to the second terminal, wherein the authorization code allows the terminal to demultiplex, decrypt and display the program as taught by Bestler in order to provide secure transmission of content.

Boyer '085 and Bestler are silent on a first receiver located at a first site, and a second receiver located at a second site geographically remote from the first site. In analogous art, Boyer '660 teaches a personal computer (28) for viewing an Web-based EPG (pg. 2, para. 0036), and a second receiver at the home, which is geographically remote from the first site (pg. 3, para. 0044), wherein the user is able to access the web page and order pay-per-view events through the web interface and deliver the event to their multimedia system (fig. 9, pg. 3, para. 0062-0063), which reads on a first receiver

Art Unit: 2623

located at a first site, and a second receiver located at a second site geographically remote from the first site.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Internet based EPG of Boyer '085 and Bestler by a first receiver located at a first site, and a second receiver located at a second site geographically remote from the first site as taught by Boyer '660 in order to facilitate users by enabling the user to order programs using a web-interface, thereby permitting users to order programs from a geographically remote location and thus increasing the usability of the system.

Regarding claim 68, Bestler teaches multiplexing the local authorization code with the program and demultiplexing (col. 3, ll. 18-22).

Regarding claim 69, Bestler teaches an authorization code addressed to specific terminals (col. 8, ll. 8-13) with an identification code identifies which programs the user is authorized to view (col. 9, ll. 28-42).

Regarding claim 70, Boyer '085 teaches the program is listed in the program guide to the first terminal by the broadcaster (fig. 1 and 3).

Regarding claim 85, Boyer is silent on debiting accounts and credit cards, however, Official Notice is taken that debiting accounts and charging credit cards is well



Art Unit: 2623

known in the art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Boyer by debiting accounts and charging credit cards in order to permit the user to easily purchase services.

Regarding claim 97, the combination of Boyer '085 and Bestler has already been discussed; Bestler teaches an authorization code addressed to specific terminals (col. 8, ll. 8-13) with an identification code identifies which programs the user is authorized to view (col. 9, ll. 28-42).

Regarding claim 169, the limitations of claim 169 have been addressed in the discussion of claim 67.

Regarding claims 170 and 171, the combination of Boyer '085 and Bestler has already been discussed; Bestler teaches multiplexing the local authorization code with the program and demultiplexing (col. 3, ll. 18-22).

Regarding claims 172-174, Boyer '085 teaches the the program is listed in an electronic program guide provided on a web page of the Internet, wherein the terminal accesses the web page to receive the web page (pg. 4, para. 0067-0068, fig. 15-34).

9. Claims 60 and 115 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication 2003/0066085 to Boyer et al. (Boyer '085),

U.S. Patent 5,517,502 Bestler et al., and U.S. Patent Application Publication 2005/0138660 to Boyer et al. (Boyer '660) in view of U.S. Patent 5,734,853 to Hendricks et al. (Hendricks '853).

Regarding claim 60, Boyer '085 is silent on a time out feature, Hendricks '853 teaches a time out (fig. 19, 20, col. 37, ll. 20-25). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Boyer '085 by using time outs as taught by Hendricks '853 to deauthorize the display and prevent charges.

Regarding claim 115, Boyer '085 is silent on a time out period and if the cancel order is not received within the time out period, sending the program order to billing system, and preparing billing. Hendricks '853 teaches a time out period and if the cancel order is not received within the time out period, then billing the user which clearly sends the program order to billing system, and preparing billing (col. 37, ll. 20-25). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Boyer '085 by a time out period and if the cancel order is not received within the time out period, sending the program order to billing system, and preparing billing as taught by Hendricks '853 in order to appropriately bill users when the program has been watched past a threshold amount.

10. Claims 86 and 116 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication 2003/0066085 to Boyer et al. (Boyer '085), U.S. Patent 5,517,502 Bestler et al., and U.S. Patent Application Publication 2005/0138660

to Boyer et al. (Boyer '660) in view of U.S. Patent 5,734,853 to Hendricks et al. (Hendricks '853) and U.S. Patent 5,600,364 to Hendricks et al. (Hendricks '364).

Regarding claim 86, Boyer is silent on the time out feature. Hendricks '853 teaches a time out and teaches canceling the program for a time prior to the start and after the start of the program (fig. 19, 20, col. 37, ll. 20-25). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Boyer by using a time out feature prior to displaying and after the start of the program as taught by Hendricks '853 in order to inhibit unauthorized viewing of programs.

Regarding claim 116, Boyer '085 is silent on a time out period, and generating a deauthorization signal if the cancel order is received, and transmitting the deauthorization signal which removes access to a previously authorized program. Hendricks '853 teaches a time out period. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Boyer '085 by a time out period as taught by Hendricks '853 in order to permit the user to escape from an ordered movie without charge. Boyer '085 and Hendricks '853 are silent on a deauthorization signal which removes access to a previously authorized program. Hendricks '364 teaches transmitting the deauthorization signal which removes access to a previously authorized program (col. 32, ll. 7-16). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Boyer '085 and Hendricks '853 by a deauthorization signal which removes access to a previously authorized program as taught by Hendricks '364 in order to prevent a

cancelled program from being viewed by a subscriber who has already received the authorization for the program.

***Conclusion***

11. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

12. U.S. Patent Application Publication 2006/0190966 to McKissick et al. teaches a viewer sending a gift to another viewer, wherein the gift may be a pre-paid pay per view authorization for a specific program, service, or package.

13. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andrew Y. Koenig whose telephone number is (571) 272-7296. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Fr (8:30 - 5:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Miller can be reached on (571)272-7353. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Andrew Y Koenig  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 2623

ayk